



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A Simple Grammar of English Now in Use. By JOHN EARLE, M.A., Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons; London, Smith, Elder & Co., 1898.

Professor Earle informs us (Preface, p. 1) that his book is "not of Philology, but of Grammar," and that its aim is "not scientific, but educational." The period treated "begins with the first generation of the sixteenth century, and covers the space of four hundred years," including in *present* English "the language of the English Bible and of Shakspeare"; but as some forms and locutions of the early sixteenth century are omitted, *present* English may be said to date from Shakspeare.

The Parts of Speech are first treated; then the Syntax, divided into 'Plain Syntax' and 'Graphic Syntax,' which is elementary rhetoric; Prosody follows, and an Appendix on Punctuation, together with Exercises in Parsing and Analysis. Professor Earle is right to include prosody, for a knowledge of it, even if elementary, aids in the appreciation of poetry, and it is too often neglected in treatises on grammar intended for the use of schools. Professor Earle says that "our earliest verse was without Metre, as it was without Rhyme," but this depends upon what we mean by metre, and it is scarcely correct to say that "Alliteration and Caesura may be said to constitute the Technique of our older poetry." These were essential features, but not the whole of it.

While not so well suited for elementary instruction, the book will be found very serviceable for more advanced pupils, and will serve to instil correct notions of grammar, and to teach pupils what they will not have to unlearn. Some points, as the nature of the umlaut plurals, *feet, teeth*, etc., and of such plurals as *deer, sheep*, etc., might have been explained, for pupils will get no better idea of these apparent anomalies in English than from an ordinary English Grammar.

The statement with respect to the genitive case of nouns ending in *-s* is not strictly in accordance with present usage, for, along with such forms as 'Cassius' dagger' we find 'Cassius's dagger.' Professor Earle rightly retains the dative case, and illustrates its use throughout the book. An expansion of his remarks on 'go a-fishing' and like phrases would be desirable, for much ignorance is prevalent as to these survivals of older English idioms.

He uses the term 'flat' for 'simple' infinitive, and has introduced some other unfamiliar terms; 'flexional' infinitive may answer for the 'gerundial' infinitive, but the latter term is more common. His remarks on such forms as 'foremost,' etc., will scarcely be understood without further explanation. Professor Earle says 'the first two,' and we agree with him, *contra* some grammarians.

A fuller explanation of the terms 'strong' and 'weak' verbs would be desirable, and in the list of strong verbs some forms are

omitted that are in current use, as weak, for older strong forms, *chided, cleaved, heaved*; also strong preterite *ēat* (*et*), as well as *ate*, and pp. *hewed*, as well as *hewn*. So some strong forms prevalent in the period treated are omitted, as pp. *crown, sitten*, preterite *slang, stang*, etc.; and older weak forms, as *shined* for *shone*.

The obsolete *yode* (went) was common in the sixteenth century, and might have been included; *rid, ris* should have been printed in thick type as obsolete, and so pp. *rose, arose*; pret. *awoke*, and pp. *abode* are in good current use and might have been so noted. Under *wend* we miss *wended, went* being alone given. But it is scarcely worth while to note a few omissions of this sort, although they could be added to.

As most grammarians, Professor Earle is a stickler for the modern distinction between *shall* and *will*—which so many regard as a shibboleth of "good English"—saying, "When *will* is put in the place of *shall*, it is a Kelticism." We must then exclude Shakspeare and the Bible from "good English" and resign them to the Kelts, for they are arch offenders in this respect. "Oh! but they were written three hundred years ago," which is true, but they are specimens of the best English then known, and this proves that the present distinction is a late one. Professor Earle violates his own rules, saying (p. 111): "There is, moreover, a third aspect, namely, the Interrogative; but we will first treat of Affirmative and Negative."

Wert (p. 48) is admitted only as subjunctive, but it is found as indicative.

'Self-verbs' (p. 51) is another original term; it means 'presentive' or 'notional,' and not auxiliary. The terms 'preterite definite' and 'preterite indefinite' (p. 46) are used in a sense exactly contrary to their usual grammatical use, for we usually understand by the former the preterite with *have*, and by the latter the aorist, not as in French.

Professor Earle says (p. 63) that, wherever *its* is found in Shakspeare, "it is generally due to some later editor"; but there are *ten* examples in the First Folio, nine of them spelt *it's* and one *its*, and Heming and Condell were hardly responsible for these forms. On p. 65, last word, 'Second' is a misprint for 'First.' The formation of the plurals of the demonstrative pronouns is omitted. A few words would have explained to beginners why *these* is used as the plural of *this*, and *those* of *that*.

The originally adjective use of *which* is unnoticed. Professor Earle says (p. 70): "In regard to 'Our Father which,' the Americans have taken a new departure, and they elect to say 'Our Father who'"; but they are not peculiar in this respect.

'Evolute' for subordinate (p. 80) is another of Professor Earle's unusual terms.

In the Syntax 'The Split Infinitive' (p. 96) scarcely meets with the condemnation that it deserves. Grammarians should

not hesitate to condemn this usage. The interposition of a plural noun can not justify the concord of a plural verb with a singular subject, even if Dean Farrar is the offender. "Homer nods" in grammar as well as elsewhere.

The examples of intransitive verbs made transitive (p. 116) might have been explained on the principles of the cognate accusative and of the causative verb. The verbal noun (Earle's 'flexional infinitive,' p. 118) is equally as common in such phrases as 'He will give up caring,' etc., as the simple (Earle's 'flat') infinitive with or without the preposition *to*.

Earle supports 'The man I had written to,' as against the purist grammarians, 'The man to whom I had written.' *The Academy* rightly regards the idiom as "a token of the progressive restitution of English."

Professor Earle's terms 'co-ordinata' and 'evoluta' are no gain over 'compound' and 'complex' sentences.

He explains as 'tense-attraction' such sentences as "But you should have endeavoured to have shown" (Pilgrim's Progress). It is an older construction, found in Shakspeare, but now condemned by the best writers.

We should scarcely say now, with Richardson, 'You have a young lady lodges here.' While the omission of the *object* relative is common enough, that of the *subject* relative is disallowed. Professor Earle mentions "the Double or Cumulate Genitive" (p. 146), but gives no explanation. After Dean Alford, he defends 'It is me' as "idiomatic English," but says: "it is not fully recognized as literary English." Lack of space forbids further notice of this useful volume.

J. M. G.

Traité de métrique grecque par P. MASQUERAY. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1899.

The 'Nouvelle collection à l'usage des classes' issued by the publishing-house of C. Klincksieck, of Paris, and comprising among other useful books F. Plessis' 'Traité de métrique grecque et latine' (1889), has now been enriched by a similar little work, which, however, is devoted to Greek metres exclusively. The title of the book is 'Traité de métrique grecque,' and its author is P. Masqueray, well known by his larger work entitled 'Théorie des formes lyriques de la tragédie grecque.' The distinguishing feature of Masqueray's new work is his peculiar treatment of Glyconic and kindred verse. Scholars of this country have, for more than a generation, been following Rossbach and Westphal or J. H. H. Schmidt for these metres, and now the author of the work under discussion, who, in the preface, acknowledges the great services rendered to the cause of Greek Rhythmic and Metric by such men as Boeckh, Rossbach and Westphal, J. H. H.